

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 25-26, 28-31 and 33-34 remain in this application. Claims 24, 27 and 32 have been amended to avoid the statutory double-patenting rejection. Claims 35-40 have been added.

Drawings 1, 2 and 4 have been objected to as having unlabeled boxes. New formal drawing 1, 2 and 4 have been submitted with the boxes labeled or changed to symbols.

The specification has been amended to reflect the Patent Number of the parent application. The abstract has been amended to delete the last line.

Claims 1-5, 13-15, 17-22, 25-26 and 28-34 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting. Claim 11 is not obvious over the claims of patent number 6,323,885 because it would not have been obvious to vary the magnitude of each subrange. The claims of the '885 patent do not recite that each of the subranges have a different magnitude. There Examiner has not pointed to anything that would suggest variation of the subrange's magnitude. Therefore, claim 11 is not obvious over the claims of the '885 patent. For all other rejected claims, the applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer once the rejected claims are allowable over prior art.

Claims 1-7, 13-17, 19-23, 25-26, 28-31 and 34 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown (U.S. Patent 5,791,216) in view Manson et al (U.S. Patent 5,731,997). Independent claims 1, 19, 25 and 28 recite associating each of a plurality of symbols with each of a plurality of geographic locations *based upon the associated values*. Neither, Brown nor Manson discloses associating a symbol based upon an associated value. Manson discloses a map having objects each corresponding to a

geographic location. However, the symbol associated with each object is not based upon the associated value of the geographic location, but the particular artifact at that location. The symbol is based upon the type of object at that location (Column 8, lines 37-53). For example, a tree symbol indicates that there is a tree at that location. Thus, even if the system of Brown were modified in accordance with the teachings of Manson, it would still not disclose associating symbols to geographic locations based upon associated values of the geographic locations. All of the symbols would be houses.

Additionally, there is no motivation to add the symbols of Manson to the geographic locations of Brown. Brown discloses a system for assisting someone who is trying to find a house to purchase. The user interface in Figure 13 of Brown shows a map with several regions so that the user can indicate the areas where the user would like to purchase a house. The user interface also provides a field for entering a price range that the user believes he can afford. Based upon these selections, Brown displays a list 212 of homes for sale in the screen shown in Figure 14. The homes in the list 212 meet the geographic and price criteria chosen by the user in the screen in Figure 13. (col. 7, line 48 to col. 8, line 5). Since the user chose the only range of values, and since only that range of values is viewed on the list, there is no point in providing symbols to distinguish among different ranges. Claims 1, 19, 25 and 28 are therefore patentable. Claims 2-7, 13-17, 20-23, 26 and 29-31 depend from patentable claims 1, 19, 25 and 28 and are therefore patentable.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Manson et al further in view of DeLorme (U.S. Patent 5,559,707). The Examiner states, “Brown and Manson do not teach that the values are street addresses.” However, this is not what is claimed. Claim 18 recites, “each of the plurality of values is *associated*

with a street address,” not that each of the plurality of values *is* a street address. Additionally, if the Examiner’s modification of the Brown interface were further modified to permit the input of a street address, there would be no need for a map of symbols each associated based upon value (as claimed), because the modified interface would select only one house (one address). Therefore, there would be no motivation for this proposed modification by the Examiner.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Brown in view Manson et al further in view of Tachibana et al (U.S. Patent 6,219,053). The Examiner admits that Brown and Manson do not teach associating each of a plurality of symbols with a different range of values. First, because the user in Brown enters a value range as part of the search criteria, there is no need for providing symbols that are each associated with a different range of values - - because only one range is provided. Additionally, Tachibana does not disclose associating different ranges of values with different symbols. The different symbols in Tachibana are each associated with different hierarchical levels in a network - - there is no “range of values” associated with each symbol in Tachibana. Therefore, claims 8-10 are independently patentable.

A check in the amount of \$54.00 is enclosed for six additional claims in excess of twenty. If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

John E. Carlson
Registration No. 37,794
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: October 5, 2004